

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Rockport Huterite Colony Lease 5993

Proposed Implementation Date: Winter 2008

Proponent: Rockport Huterite Colony – P.O. Box 100 Pendroy, MT 59467 Ph. (406) 469-2284

Type and Purpose of Action: To implement a new water development system on the below described tracts of land. The primary objective is to enhance livestock distribution and provide a more reliable source of stock water. This assessment evaluated one state tract comprising one stock tank and approximately 3100 feet of proposed pipeline. The state tract evaluated for this proposal is part of a larger Federal USDA EQUIP Project. A detailed map showing the locations for the project lay out is included within this assessment.

Location: T27N, R7W, Sec 32
Common School Grant

County: Teton

I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. | DNRC, Surface owner
Rockport Huterite Colony, Surface Lessee
Teton County NRCS Office |
| 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED: | None |
| 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: | Deny the request |

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N]	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
	N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)	
4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactable or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?		[N] This proposal lies within a large upland pediment dissected by gentle drainages. The soils are moderately deep. The soils vary between silt and clay loam textures. The pipeline to serve the water tanks will be ripped in place, and the sod will be back filled after completion. Reclamation of the line is not initially

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	required but will be evaluated after installation has been completed. The proposed pipeline is anticipated to have limited disturbance, and usually will naturally vegetate within the first year. Productive soils and gentle topography influence the rate of natural revegetation. The project has good productive loams, and traverses moderately flat topography. The primary plant composition is dominated by Blue bunch Wheatgrass, Rough Fescue, and Shrubby Cinquefoil.
5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] Ground water volume will be slightly impacted if drilling is successful. The aquifer that will be drill tested will be within the Eagle Sands. Anticipated depth will be less than 400 feet. Anticipated volume can range between 2 & 100 GPM.
6. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There will be no impact to the air shed as a result of this proposal.
7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[Y] The vegetative community has the most impact from this type of proposal. The disturbance from the pipeline installation will be minimal due to the productive soil types, the gentle topography, and the construction plan. This project requires backfilling the soil and sod profile after completion. The new water source will attract greater livestock numbers to the area, thus changing the dynamics of the vegetative community. This can be a positive response or a negative response depending on management.
8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There will not be any adverse impact to fish, wildlife, or birds resulting from this proposal.
9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There are no endangered or threatened species or habitat present on this site. However, the project does lie west of US highway 89. Any land west of this road is subject to being sensitive for wildlife.
10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] During the field inspection there were no historic sites found. The lease records also indicated no cultural sites present within the proposed area.
11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] There are no prominent topographic features within the proposed area.
12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, and AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action?	[N] Agriculture is basically the sole industry in the area. There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to other activities in the area resulting from this proposal.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of other private, state or federal current actions w/n the analysis area, or from future proposed state actions that are under MEPA review (scoping) or permitting review	[N] None

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

by any state agency w/n the analysis area?

III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE

[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

- | RESOURCE | [Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES |
|---|---|
| 14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area? | [N] This project will not add to the health and safety of the area. |
| 15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities? | [Y] This project could increase the stocking rate for the producer due to an increase in forage base resulting in increased water distribution. |
| 16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] This project will create a contracting job for drilling, and the installation of the lines and tanks. |
| 17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [Y] This project will create some tax revenue during the planning and installation phase. |
| 18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] There will not be substantial traffic added to the area as a result of this project. |
| 19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect? | [N] None |
| 20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] There are no wilderness areas accessed through this tract. |
| 21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing? Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] None |
| 22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible? | [N] None |
| 23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area? | [N] None |
| 24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES: Is there a potential for other future uses for easement area other than for current management? Is future use hypothetical? What is the estimated return to the trust. Are cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of this proposed action? | [N] No cumulative impacts are likely to occur as a result of this proposed action. |

EA Checklist Prepared By: Steve Dobson
Name

LUS Conrad Unit Date: 1-3-08
Title

IV. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Approve the improvement request for installing a livestock water tank and associated pipeline.

26. SIGN4IFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

Short-term and small-scale impacts to the native rangeland under and around the pipeline route is expected. All disturbed areas will be recontoured and reseeded to native grass according to the specifications outlined in this EA. No Archaeological sites are present within the project area. The livestock stock water project will benefit pasture distribution and improve utilization. Overall, no negative environmental impacts are expected.

27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:

☐ EIS ☐ More Detailed EA ☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By: Erik Eneboe Conrad Unit Manager - CLO
Name Title

Signature January 7, 2008
Date